

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

MEGAN GAHAN,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Civ. No. 12-1297 KG/SCY

BRODERICK SHARP, SEAN CONNORS,  
ANTHONY MEDRANO, and COLLEN BULTMAN,

Defendants.

ORDER ON MOTIONS IN LIMINE

On March 6, 2015, the Court held a hearing on the motions in limine filed by Defendants and Plaintiff on February 18, 2015. (Docs. 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, and 139). Responses to those motions in limine were filed on February 25, 2015. (Docs. 146, 147, 148, 150, 152, 155, 156, 158, 159, and 160). Jack Jacks and Matthew Coyte represented Plaintiff at the hearing. Luis Robles, Lindsay Drennan, and Nicholas Autio represented Defendants.

Having considered the motions in limine, the responses, and the argument of counsel, the Court **ORDERS** that

1. County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. I: The Exclusion of Evidence at Trial Regarding Defendants' and Witness Officers' Conduct in Prior and Subsequent, Unrelated Incidents (Doc. 130) is denied;

2. County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. II: Exclusion of Testimony from Deputy Nathan Harger Regarding Defendant Broderick Sharp's Prior Unrelated Alleged Misconduct (Doc. 131) is denied;

3. County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. III: Admission of Evidence Regarding the Bernalillo County Sheriff's Department's Investigation into Alleged Criminal Activity at 6613 Kelly NE (Doc. 132) is denied;

4. ruling on County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. IV: The Exclusion of Evidence at Trial Regarding Less Intrusive Alternatives (Doc. 133) is reserved;

5. County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. V: Admission of Evidence of Plaintiff's Prior and Recent Drug Use at Trial (Doc. 134) is granted;


6. County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. VI: Motion to Admit Evidence of Traumatic Events in Plaintiff's Past and Evidence of Plaintiff's Mental Health History (Doc. 135) is granted;

7. County Defendants' Motion in Limine No. VII: Exclusion of Expert Testimony Regarding Plaintiff's Credibility (Doc. 136) is denied as moot;

8. Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. I: Preclude Defendants from Testifying or Arguing that the Search Warrant for 6604 Kelly NE Gave Them Legal Justification or Probable Cause to Take Plaintiff to the Substation and/or Arrest Plaintiff (Doc. 137) is denied;

9. Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. II: Exclude Any Reference to the Search Warrant for and Investigation of 6613 Kelly NE (Doc. 138) is granted; and

10. Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. III: Preclude Defendants from Testifying or Arguing that the Search Warrant for 6604 Kelly NE Gave Them Legal Justification to Stop Plaintiff in a Vehicle Over One Mile from the Target Residence (Doc. 139) is denied.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE